

Appl. No. 10/008,881
Response dated December 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2003

REMARKS

Claim 11 was objected to because the word "comprises" appeared twice consecutively. Claim 11 has been amended address this informality by removing the redundant "comprises", such that this is not a narrowing amendment and the claim is entitled to its full scope under the doctrine of equivalents.

Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,326,286 B1). No claims have been allowed. Applicant has amended claim 7 and has added new claim 12.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F. 2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051,1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. See MPEP 2131.

With regard to claim 5, Park *et al.* does not teach the use of a first array of beamlets, a second array of beamlets, a third array of beamlets, and a fourth array of beamlets. The mask 180 that is shown in Fig. 18A, which appears to provide the basis of the rejection, does not show four arrays. No additional basis has been provided to show anticipation of every element as set forth in the claim.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and is not anticipated by Park *et al.* for the reasons identified above in connection with claim 5.

With regard to independent claim 7, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that both the first set of slits and the second set of slits are illuminated simultaneously. For support see lines 4 through 7 on page 8. Park

Appl. No. 10/008,881
Response dated December 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2003

does not teach that the two sets of slits are illuminated simultaneously. See Col. 11, lines 5 through 37. Amended claim 7 is no longer anticipated by Park. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 7.

Claims 8 through 11 depend from claim 7 and should also be allowed for the reasons given above in connection with claim 7.

Applicant has added new claim 12, which is similar to claim 5 and should be allowed for the reasons specified above in connection with claim 5.

Claim 12 is further allowable in that it has additional limitations not found in claim 5, such as the requirement that the movement in the lateral direction be in the same for each of the stepping steps.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/29/2003

By: Matthew D. Rabdau
Matthew D. Rabdau,
Reg. No. 43,026

Matthew D. Rabdau, Patent Attorney
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
5750 NW Pacific Rim Blvd.
Camas, WA 98607

Telephone: (360) 834-8567
Facsimile: (360) 817-8505